

EXHIBIT B

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP

David Boies (admitted pro hac vice)

333 Main Street

Armonk, NY 10504

Tel: (914) 749-8200

dboies@bsfllp.com

Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165

Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No. 238027

Erika Nyborg-Burch, CA Bar No. 342125

44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104

Tel.: (415) 293-6800

mmao@bsfllp.com

brichardson@bsfllp.com

enyborg-burch@bsfllp.com

James Lee (admitted pro hac vice)

Rossana Baeza (admitted pro hac vice)

100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor

Miami, FL 33131

Tel.: (305) 539-8400

jlee@bsfllp.com

rbaeza@bsfllp.com

Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334

725 S Figueroa St., 31st Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90017

Tel.: (213) 995-5720

alanderson@bsfllp.com

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.

Bill Carmody (admitted pro hac vice)

Shawn J. Rabin (admitted pro hac vice)

Steven M. Shepard (admitted pro hac vice)

Alexander Frawley (admitted pro hac vice)

1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor

New York, NY 10019

Tel.: (212) 336-8330

bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com

srabin@susmangodfrey.com

sshepard@susmangodfrey.com

afrawley@susmangodfrey.com

Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891

1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Tel.: (310) 789-3100

abonn@susmangodfrey.com

MORGAN & MORGAN

John A. Yanchunis (admitted pro hac vice)

Ryan J. McGee (admitted pro hac vice)

201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor

Tampa, FL 33602

Tel.: (813) 223-5505

jyanchunis@forthepeople.com

rmcgee@forthepeople.com

Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805

711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500

San Francisco, CA 94102

Tel: (415) 358-6913

mram@forthepeople.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, SAL CATALDO,
JULIAN SANTIAGO, and SUSAN LYNN
HARVEY individually and on behalf of all
other similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 3:20-cv-04688-RS

**PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED RULE
26 DISCLOSURES**

1 Plaintiffs amend their initial disclosures per Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1).

2 **I. NAMES AND ADDRESSES OF INDIVIDUALS LIKELY TO POSSESS**
3 **DISCOVERABLE INFORMATION**

4 The following individuals and/or entities may possess discoverable information that
5 Plaintiffs may use to support their claims. Documents and information identifying additional
6 witnesses are in the possession and control of Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) and non-parties
7 to this litigation. Plaintiffs reserve the right to supplement or amend these lists as discovery
8 proceeds.

9 **A. Plaintiffs**

10 Plaintiff Anibal Rodriguez has knowledge about his use of mobile apps and Google Search
11 and his effort to turn off Google’s “Web & App Activity” tracking. Plaintiff Rodriguez may only
12 be contacted through counsel, but pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order, ECF No. 70,
13 provides his CONFIDENTIAL contact information as follows:

14 [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED]

17 Plaintiff Julian Santiago has knowledge about his use of mobile apps and Google Search
18 and his effort to turn off Google’s “Web & App Activity” tracking. Plaintiff Santiago may only be
19 contacted through counsel, but pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order, ECF No. 70, provides
20 his CONFIDENTIAL contact information as follows:

21 [REDACTED]
22 [REDACTED]
23 [REDACTED]

24 Plaintiff Susan Lynn Harvey has knowledge about her use of mobile apps and Google
25 Search and her effort to turn off Google’s “Web & App Activity” tracking. Plaintiff Harvey may
26 only be contacted through counsel, but pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order, ECF No. 70,
27 provides her CONFIDENTIAL contact information as follows:

28 [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3
 4 Plaintiff Sal Cataldo has knowledge about his use of mobile apps and Google Search and
 5 his effort to turn off Google's "Web & App Activity" tracking. Plaintiff Cataldo may only be
 6 contacted through counsel, but pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order, ECF No. 70, provides
 7 his CONFIDENTIAL contact information as follows:

8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10
 11 **B. Current or Former Employees of Google and Non-Parties**

12 Current or former Google employees with knowledge of its privacy disclosures, Firebase
 13 SDK, use of data intercepted/collected by Google when users have turned off "Web & App
 14 Activity" tracking, financial information and revenues attributable to the use of any user data by
 15 Google, and any knowledge of the following categories of documents:

- 16 • Google's disclosures and policies relating to the data it collects directly and indirectly
 17 on consumers, particularly with regard to data collected on consumers who have turned
 18 off "Web & App Activity" tracking.
- 19 • Google's logs relating to the data it collects directly and indirectly on consumers,
 20 particularly with regard to data collected on consumers who have turned off "Web &
 21 App Activity" tracking.
- 22 • Google's internal documents relating to consumers' control over how their data is
 23 collected, used, shared, and disposed.
- 24 • Google's internal documents relating to transparency about how consumers' data is
 25 collected, used, shared, and disposed.
- 26 • Google's written representations to and agreements with websites, web publishers, web
 27 applications, and mobile app publishers that use Google services, including but not
 28 limited to what data Google collects and how Google complies with laws and
 regulations regarding the collection of data.
- Google's technical documents relating to how its technologies and services work with
 consumer data that it collects directly and indirectly, particularly with regard to data
 collected while consumers have turned off "Web & App Activity" tracking.
- Google's documents concerning its acquisition of Firebase and technical documents
 relating to Firebase SDK.

- 1 • Google's technical documents relating to how to track individual consumers, their devices, and their locations.
- 2 • Google's responses and document productions to regulators, including without
- 3 limitation the U.S. Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and Department of Justice (DoJ),
- 4 the Arizona Attorney General, the California Attorney General, European data
- 5 protection authorities, and the Australian Competition & Consumer Commission
- 6 (ACCC), relating to Google's disclosures and data collection practices between at least
- 7 2011 and the present.
- 8 • Google's assurances, at any time, to not merge first- and third-party data and services.
- 9 • Google's compliance and audit documents relating to its efforts and/or failures to
- 10 comply with the Google-FTC Consent Decree of 2011, relating to Google's Buzz
- 11 Social Network.
- 12 • Google's external and internal documents relating to how Google attempted to comply
- 13 and/or complied with the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), Europe's General
- 14 Data Privacy Regulation (GDPR), and similar legislation.
- 15 • Google's external and internal documents relating to how Google lobbied for or against
- 16 bills and proposed laws in the United States similar to or based on the California
- 17 Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).
- 18 • Google's external and internal documents relating to any new privacy features Google
- 19 has released or is releasing with regard to opting out of web and app activity tracking,
- 20 and Google Analytics.
- 21 • Google's sales documents relating to its profits from Google Analytics (and legacy
- 22 products that was eventually merged into Google Analytics) that may relate to how
- 23 Google profited from the allegations at issue in the Complaint.
- 24 • Google's sales documents relating to its profits from Google Ad Manager (and legacy
- 25 products that was eventually merged into Google Ad Manager) that may relate to how
- 26 Google profited from the allegations at issue in the Complaint.
- 27 • Google's documents showing how Google improved its Google products and services
- 28 (including but not limited to Search, Google Analytics, and Google Ad Manager) based
- on data Google obtained relating to the allegations at issue in the Complaint.
- All ways in which Google has benefited from the unlawful conduct alleged in this lawsuit, including without limitation advertising revenues.

23 Additionally, Plaintiffs have identified, through investigation and review of discovery, that

24 the following current and former Google employees may have knowledge or information relevant

25 to this case, including the following topics and topics addressed during their depositions:

26 David Monsees: Mr. Monsees is a Product Manager at Google, and Plaintiffs reasonably

27 expect him to testify to his familiarity with the Web & App Activity controls, including WAA,

28 sWAA, sWAAdl, and their functionality (including the datatypes controlled thereby); the

1 disclosures that Google provides to consumers concerning Web & App Activity controls; how
2 Google logs and tracks activity when these controls are enabled and disabled (including the
3 associated identifiers); uniform user confusion related to Web & App Activity controls; and how
4 Google uses this data (both when enabled and disabled).

5 Edward Weng: Mr. Weng was a Product Manager at Google, and Plaintiffs reasonably
6 expect him to testify to his familiarity with the Web & App Activity controls, including WAA,
7 sWAA, sWAAdl, and their functionality (including the datatypes controlled thereby); the
8 disclosures that Google provides to consumers concerning Web & App Activity controls; how
9 Google logs and tracks activity when these controls are enabled and disabled (including the
10 associated identifiers); uniform user confusion related to Web & App Activity controls; and how
11 Google uses this data (both when enabled and disabled).

12 Chris Ruemmler: Mr. Ruemmler is a Senior Staff Software Engineer at Google, and
13 Plaintiffs reasonably expect him to testify to his familiarity with the Web & App Activity controls,
14 including WAA and sWAA, and their functionality (including the datatypes controlled thereby);
15 the disclosures that Google provides to consumers concerning Web & App Activity controls; how
16 Google logs and tracks activity when these controls are enabled and disabled (including the
17 associated identifiers); uniform user confusion related to Web & App Activity controls; and how
18 Google uses this data (both when enabled and disabled).

19 Greg Fair: Greg Fair was a Product Manager at Google, and Plaintiffs reasonably expect
20 him to testify to his familiarity with the Web & App Activity controls, including WAA and sWAA,
21 and their functionality (including the datatypes controlled thereby); the disclosures that Google
22 provides to consumers concerning Web & App Activity controls and how Google has studied
23 consumers' uniform confusion related to Web & App Activity controls; Google's efforts to study
24 the financial impacts of Web & App Activity controls on Google's revenue and profits; and how
25 Google logs and tracks Web & App Activity data, including by use of dashboards.

26 Eric Miraglia: Mr. Miraglia is a Senior Director of Product Management at Google, and
27 Plaintiffs reasonably expect him to testify to his familiarity with the Web & App Activity controls,
28 including WAA and sWAA, and their functionality (including the datatypes controlled thereby);

1 the disclosures that Google provides to consumers concerning Web & App Activity controls; how
2 Google deployed promises it did not intend to keep with its Narnia program to manufacture consent
3 for its unauthorized collection practices of WAA-off data; how Google logs and tracks Web &
4 App Activity data, including by use of dashboards; and user confusion related to Web & App
5 Activity controls.

6 Steve Ganem: Mr. Ganem is a Group Product Manager at Google, and Plaintiffs reasonably
7 expect him to testify to his familiarity with the Web & App Activity controls, including WAA and
8 sWAA and their functionality (including the datatypes controlled thereby); the disclosures that
9 Google provides to consumers concerning Web & App Activity controls; how Google uses Web
10 & App Activity data, including for ad targeting and personalization; the ways in which Google
11 logs and tracks Web & App Activity data, including when those controls are enabled and disabled;
12 how captured Web & App Activity data is stored and how long that data is retained; and how
13 captured Web & App Activity data may be joined to specific devices and Google accounts and
14 used to identify users.

15 Dan Stone: Mr. Stone is a former Group Product Manager at Google, and Plaintiffs
16 reasonably expect him to testify concerning the technical functioning of Google Analytics for
17 Firebase, the flow of app activity data Google collects using Google Analytics for Firebase,
18 Google's use of data it collects using Google Analytics for Firebase, the relationship between
19 Google Analytics and Google's advertising products, and other topics addressed during his
20 deposition.

21 Rahul Oak: Mr. Oak is a former Group Product Manager at Google, and Plaintiffs
22 reasonably expect him to testify concerning the functioning of the Google Analytics for Firebase
23 and Google Mobile Ads SDKs; how Google uses app activity data for purposes of advertising,
24 conversion tracking, attribution, and development of Google's products and services; and other
25 topics and documents addressed during his deposition.

26 Belinda Langner: Ms. Langner is a Director of Product Management for Google's App Ads
27 business, and Plaintiffs reasonably expect her to testify concerning Google's use of app activity
28 data for purposes of advertising, conversion tracking and attribution, and development of Google

1 products and services, as well as the Rule 30(b)(6) topics for which she was designated as Google's
2 corporate representative and other topics addressed during her deposition.

3 Sam Heft-Luthy: Mr. Heft-Luthy was a Product Manager in Google's Privacy & Data
4 Protection Office. He was involved in creating a Google "Privacy Hub" to explain "what data
5 Google collects from a given product, how it's used, and what mechanisms of controls users have
6 over their data" including with WAA. GOOG-RDGZ-00014410. His work involved "research
7 meta-analysis" and "a series of stakeholder interviews . . . with people working on privacy across
8 Google." *Calhoun v. Google*, No. 20-cv-05146-YGR, ECF No. 871-3 (order with findings) ¶¶ 128,
9 140. Google asserts a consent defense, and internal Google documents relating to the
10 "Pri***Na***e" project state that Google's consent approach was "out-of-step with user
11 expectations and regulations" in a manner that "makes it difficult for people to understand how we
12 use their data." *Id.* ¶ 141. Interview notes further acknowledge that Google had "gaps in how our
13 system works and what we promise to people" such that "[u]sers don't know what is happening."
14 *Id.* ¶ 142. Testimony by Mr. Heft-Luthy concerning these projects and admissions is clearly
15 relevant to Plaintiffs' claims and Google's defenses.

16 Arne de Booij: Mr. de Booij is a Google User Experience Research Manager tasked with
17 designing and overseeing studies of user preferences and views, including WAA. Through a
18 limited 3.5 hours deposition of Mr. de Booij, Plaintiffs seek to develop testimony regarding these
19 studies of users' understanding of WAA disclosures. Plaintiffs deposed Mr. de Booij's former
20 manager Greg Fair, but Mr. Fair could not provide the more detailed testimony that Plaintiffs
21 anticipate from Mr. de Booij. Fair Rough Tr. 144:14-149:25 (declining to provide testimony).
22 Plaintiffs also deposed the Founder of Google's Privacy and Data Protection Office, Eric Miraglia,
23 who described Mr. de Booij as "the researcher who founded the Pinecone program" which oversaw
24 one study that sought to determine why "users don't understand what WAA means." Miraglia
25 Rough Tr. 174:7-175:21. Mr. Miraglia also explained that "I'm sure there have been many studies
26 over the years that touched on" "what users would expect to happen when WAA is off," but he
27 could not recall "specific studies." *Id.* 196:12-19. This case focuses on Google's WAA controls,
28 and Plaintiffs should hear from the employee responsible for studying users' perceptions of WAA.

1 Xinyu Ye: Plaintiffs seek the testimony of Ye, a Software Engineer in Google's Privacy
 2 Working Group, to shed light on what data Google collects when WAA is off, where Google saves
 3 that WAA-off data, and how Google uses that WAA-off data. Ye has documents showing what
 4 percent of data is used by various Google products such as AdMob, GOOG-RDGZ-00180644, as
 5 well as documents demonstrating how Google uses Google Analytics and AdWords to convert
 6 data using "client ID." GOOG-RDGZ-00179824. Ye also has documents on how Google stores
 7 and uses data collected from users who switched off WAA as well as documents regarding
 8 "joinability risks" with respect to "link[ing] app events collected by GA4F to GAIA ID even if
 9 end users turn off WAA." GOOG-RDGZ-00033244; GOOG-RDGZ-00181801 ("ID joinability
 10 has been one of the biggest challenges in Google Analytics since introduction of Gaia IDs in GA");
 11 GOOG-RDGZ-00184488 ("Firebase: IID which can map to GAIA to join to app instance id").

12 JK Kearns: Mr. Kearns is a Group Product Manager who vocalized discomfort with the
 13 fact that Google continued to collect and save data even when the WAA/sWAA button had been
 14 toggled to "off." *See, e.g.*, GOOG-RDGZ-00043966 (Mr. Kearns wrote: "To me, it feels like a
 15 fairly significant bug that a user can choose to turn off WAA but then *we still collect and use the*
 16 *data* (even locally)") (emphasis added); GOOG-RDGZ-00090741 (Mr. Kearns noting that the
 17 disclosures "feel[] *misleading* as it's currently written") (emphasis added); GOOG-RDGZ-
 18 00039094 (Mr. Kearns stating that "teams *should not use user data at all if WAA is off*") (emphasis
 19 added). These admissions go to the heart of this case.

20 Non-parties who make use of data intercepted/collected by Google, including when users
 21 have turned off "Web & App Activity" tracking.

22 Plaintiffs have also identified Dr. Blake Lemoine, a former Google employee (but who
 23 Google did not identify as a potential document custodian) who may have knowledge or
 24 information relevant to this case about Google's collection and use of (s)WAA off data, including
 25 without limitation for various AI-based algorithms, and also regarding Google's internal processes
 26 in connection with documenting, monitoring, and overseeing and addressing problems. Dr.
 27 Lemoine has retained the undersigned counsel and may only be contacted through undersigned
 28 counsel.

II. DESCRIPTION OF ALL RELEVANT DOCUMENTS IN PLAINTIFFS' POSSESSION

Plaintiffs possess relevant documents from their Google Takeout data, which is in the possession, custody, and control of Google (and accessible to Plaintiffs via <https://takeout.google.com/settings/takeout>) relating to their use of mobile apps, advertisements displayed to them, and documents relating to their request for damages. Plaintiffs also possess emails from Google related to “Privacy Checkup” and/or consent bumps under Google’s Narnia program that encouraged people who turned WAA and/or sWAA off to turn those functions back on. In addition, Plaintiffs may use certain publicly available documents, such as Google’s representations and press releases, marketing materials, and industry reports.

Plaintiffs may also rely on documents produced in this litigation. Plaintiffs have previously identified a number of these documents, including in correspondence with Google’s counsel, discovery requests and disputes, motions filed with the Court, Plaintiffs’ complaints, and the parties’ expert reports. These documents fall into a number of categories, including:

- Google’s Terms of Service, Privacy Policy, and other public disclosures relating to Firebase, Ad Manager, AdMob, and Google Ads, the Web & App Activity setting, and the supplemental Web & App Activity setting;
- Documents concerning the functionality of the Firebase SDK, Google Mobile Ads SDK, AdMob, Ad Manager, and Google Ads;
- Documents concerning the types of data collected through the Firebase SDK and Google Mobile Ads SDK;
- Documents concerning the flow of data collected through the Firebase SDK and the Google Mobile Ads SDK;
- Documents concerning the use of data collected through the Firebase SDK and the Google Mobile Ads SDK;
- Documents concerning Google’s knowledge that it lacked permission to collect, save, and/or use app activity data from (s)WAA-off users; and
- Other documents identified during Plaintiffs’ ongoing investigation pertaining to

1 this matter.

2 Plaintiffs are continuing their investigation and reserve the right to supplement and/or
3 amend this response to identify additional documents, electronically stored information, and
4 tangible things they may use in support of their claims. As one example, Google is in possession
5 of documents reflecting Dr. Lemoine's relevant knowledge and communications at Google, and
6 Plaintiffs will be requesting those documents.

7 **III. DAMAGES**

8 Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages, punitive and exemplary damages, restitution, and
9 disgorgement, pre-judgment interest, post-judgment interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, expert
10 witness fees and other costs, and any other further relief as the Court deems just and proper,
11 including equitable, declarative, and injunctive relief as permitted by law. Plaintiffs seek non-
12 restitutionary disgorgement and actual damages, as described in Michael J. Lasinski's expert report
13 dated and served on February 20, 2023. Plaintiffs also seek nominal and punitive damages.

14 **IV. INSURANCE AGREEMENT**

15 Not applicable to Plaintiffs.

16 Dated: October 4, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

17 By: /s/ Mark C. Mao

18 Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)
19 mmao@bsfllp.com
20 Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027)
brichardson@bsfllp.com
21 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
22 44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
23 Telephone: (415) 293 6858
Facsimile (415) 999 9695

24 David Boies (admitted *pro hac vice*)
25 dboies@bsfllp.com
26 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
27 Telephone: (914) 749-8200

28 James Lee (admitted *pro hac vice*)

1 jlee@bsfllp.com
2 Rossana Baeza (admitted *pro hac vice*)
3 rbaeza@bsfllp.com
4 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
5 100 SE 2nd Street, Suite 2800
6 Miami, FL 33131
7 Telephone: (305) 539-8400
8 Facsimile: (305) 539-1307

9
10 Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334
11 725 S Figueroa St., 31st Floor
12 Los Angeles, CA 90017
13 Tel.: (213) 995-5720
14 alanderson@bsfllp.com

15
16 Bill Carmody (*pro hac vice*)
17 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com
18 Shawn J. Rabin (*pro hac vice*)
19 srabin@susmangodfrey.com
20 Steven Shepard (*pro hac vice*)
21 sshepard@susmangodfrey.com
22 Alexander P. Frawley
23 afrawley@susmangodfrey.com
24 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
25 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
26 New York, NY 10019
27 Telephone: (212) 336-8330

18 Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)
19 abonn@susmangodfrey.com
20 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
21 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
22 Los Angeles, CA 90067
23 Telephone: (310) 789-3100

21 John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)
22 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com
23 Ryan J. McGee (*pro hac vice*)
24 rmcgee@forthepeople.com
25 Michael F. Ram (CA Bar No. 238027)
26 mram@forthepeople.com
27 MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.
28 201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Telephone: (813) 223-5505
Facsimile: (813) 222-4736

Attorneys for Plaintiffs